

**Online Comment by User: PaulFChapman**

Submitted on: 10/18/2006 7:01:00 AM

Comment Category: Other 6-Lane Options

Comment Location: Chapter-10, Page-2

Address: , , 98103

Comment:

**I-0779-001** | A Montlake Freeway stop is critical hundreds (if not thousands) of commuters use that stop!

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-1

Comment:

**I-0779-002** | The No-Build alternative has got to be DOA. We can't wait until the bridge sinks in rush-hour traffic to replace it!

Comment Category: Second Montlake Bridge

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-28

Comment:

**I-0779-003** | Eliminating the Montlake stop is a bad, bad idea. Right now I (and many others) connect to bus routes coming from downtown at Montlake. We do this because it is much faster and convenient to get the bus at Montlake than to get the bus downtown (going downtown would add half an hour to my already 1-hour commute each day! I've tried it!). Unless these numerous bus routes are re-routed to go through the Pacific Street Transfer Point (not likely!), eliminating the Montlake Stop is going to cut off hundreds of commuters from convenient bus access.

Clearly even a rebuilt or expanded 520 bridge is not going to accommodate all of the traffic in the corridor in the future. It is critical that transit service be improved by the new bridge. And that means keeping the Montlake Flyer stop.

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-7

Comment:

**I-0779-004** | The 4-lane alternative should be a non-starter. It is critical to the economic future and the livability of the Seattle region that we improve mass transit options. Mass transit is attractive only when it provides a better service than driving alone: cheaper or faster or more convenient. A 4-lane replacement simply forces mass transit into the same bad traffic as everyone else, except that you have to wait for the bus and sit next to people you don't know.

**I-0779-005** | The 6-lane alternative with HOV lanes is, in my opinion, the only viable option as it improves mass transit options. Please do not listen to the detractors who live in the neighborhoods next to the bridge. They bought their house knowing that there was a major freeway there. They should not now complain that there is a major freeway nearby.

**I-0779-006** | I also hope that part of this project includes moving the HOV lanes to the inside of the highway rather than the outside. The current 520 HOV lanes are of limited value because HOV & Transit get stuck in traffic from on/off ramps.

Comment Category: Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-2

Comment:

**I-0779-001**

**Comment Summary:**

Montlake Freeway Transit Station

**Response:**

See Section 2.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-0779-002**

**Comment Summary:**

No Build Alternative

**Response:**

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-0779-003**

**Comment Summary:**

Montlake Freeway Transit Station

**Response:**

See Section 2.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-0779-004**

**Comment Summary:**

4-Lane Alternative

**Response:**

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-0779-005**

**Comment Summary:**

6-Lane Alternative

**I-0779-007**

the 6-lane alternative & the Pacific Street Interchange look great to me!

**Comment Category:** Aesthetics and Visual Quality

**Comment Location:** Chapter-8, Page-3

**Comment:**

6-lane option looks great to me!

**Response:**

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-0779-006**

**Comment Summary:**

Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning

**Response:**

See Section 2.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-0779-007**

**Comment Summary:**

6-Lane Alternative

**Response:**

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.